



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

Corporate Patent Counsel  
nLight Photonics  
5408 NE 88th Street Building E  
Vancouver WA 98665

**MAILED**

**MAR 27 2012**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Patent No. 6,663,785 :  
Issue date: December 16, 2003 :  
Application No. 10/092,018 :  
Filed: March 6, 2002 :  
Attorney Docket No. NLIGHT-FULB001 :  
For: BROAD SPECTRUM EMITTER  
ARRAY AND METHODS FOR  
FABRICATION THEREOF

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), filed February 10, 2012 (certificate of mailing date February 7, 2012) to accept an unavoidably delayed payment of the 7 ½ year maintenance fee for the above-identified patent.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

If reconsideration of this decision is desired, a petition for reconsideration under 37 CFR 1.378(e) must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. No extension of this 2-month time limit can be granted under 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b). Any such petition for reconsideration must be accompanied by the petition fee of \$400. The petition for reconsideration should include an exhaustive attempt to provide the lacking item noted below, since, after a decision on the petition for reconsideration, no further reconsideration or review of the matter will be undertaken by the Director.

The patent issued December 16, 2003. The 7 ½ year maintenance fee could have been paid from December 16, 2010 through June 16, 2011, or with a surcharge during the period from June 17, 2011 through December 16, 2011. The 7 ½ year maintenance fee was not timely paid. Accordingly, the patent expired on December 17, 2011.

### Statute and Regulation

37 CFR 1.378(a) provides that the Director may accept the payment of any maintenance fee due on a patent based on an expiration of the patent, if, upon petition, the delay in payment of the maintenance fee is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been unavoidable or unintentional. The appropriate surcharge set forth in § 1.20(i) must be paid as a condition of accepting payment of the maintenance fee. The surcharges set at 37 CFR 1.20(i) are established

pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and, therefore, are not subject to small entity provisions of 35 U.S.C. 41(h). No separate petition fee is required for this petition. If the Director accepts payment of the maintenance fee upon petition, the patent shall be considered as not having expired but will be subject to the intervening rights and provisions of 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(2).

The patent statute at 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(1) provides as follows:

"The Director may accept the payment of any maintenance fee required by subsection (b) of this section... at any time after the six-month grace period if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been unavoidable."

The statute's promulgating rule, 37 CFR 1.378(b), provides that any petition to accept the delayed payment of a maintenance fee must include the following:

- (1) the required maintenance fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(e) - (g);
- (2) the surcharge set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(i)(1); and
- (3) a showing that the delay was unavoidable since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent. The required showing must enumerate the steps taken to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly.

Furthermore, an adequate showing requires a statement by all persons with direct knowledge of the cause of the delay, setting forth the facts as they know them. Such a statement must be verified if made by a person not registered to practice before the Patent and Trademark Office. Copies of all documentary evidence referred to in a statement should be furnished as exhibits to the statement.

### Opinion

Petitioner, nLIGHT Photonics Corporation (assignee), asserts that the delay in payment of the 7 ½ year maintenance fee was unavoidable because petitioner did not receive any Office correspondence related to the patent, including maintenance fee reminders. Control over the patent was transferred from an outside firm to nLIGHT internal patent counsel during June or July of 2011. Unfortunately, the firm changed the fee address for all patents that it formerly handled to an incorrect customer number – in other words, a customer number **not** associated with nLIGHT patent counsel. As a result, nLIGHT internal patent counsel did not receive any Office correspondence pertaining to this patent.

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3).

Petitions for the delayed payment of maintenance fees under 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(1) are treated under the same standard as petitions for revival of abandoned applications under 35 U.S.C. 133 because both statutory provisions use the same language, i.e., “unavoidable” delay. Ray v. Leyman, 55 F.3d 606, 608-609, 34 USPQ2d 1786, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (quoting In re Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm’r Pat. 1988), aff’d, Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F. Supp. 900, 16 USPQ2d 1876 (D.D.C. 1990), aff’d, 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (table), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1075 (1992)). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable as follows:

The word ‘unavoidable’....is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.

In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-515 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm’r Pat. 1887); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-168 (D.D.C. 1963), aff’d, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 139, 141 (1913)). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a “case by case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account.” Smith v. Massinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). The requirement in 35 U.S.C. 133 for a showing of unavoidable delay requires not only a showing that the delay which resulted in the abandonment of the application was unavoidable (or expiration of the patent as it applies to 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(1)), but also a showing of unavoidable delay from the time an applicant becomes aware of the abandonment of the application until the filing of a petition to revive (or a petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b) to reinstate the patent under 35 U.S.C. 41(c)(1)). See In re Application of Takao, 17 USPQ2d 1155 (Comm’r Pat. 1990). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was “unavoidable.” Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-317, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-1132 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

35 U.S.C. 41(c) requires the payment of fees at specified intervals to maintain a patent in force, rather than some response to a specific action by the Office under 35 U.S.C. 133. Consequently, a reasonably prudent person in the exercise of due care and diligence will take steps to ensure the timely payment of maintenance fees. Ray, 55 F.3d at 609, 34 USPQ2d at 1788. Thus, it follows that an adequate showing of unavoidable delay in payment of a maintenance fee, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3), requires a showing of the steps taken to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fees for the patent. Id. Where the record fails to disclose that the patentee took reasonable steps, or discloses that the patentee took no steps, to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) preclude acceptance of the delayed payment of the maintenance fee.

In view of the requirement to enumerate the steps taken to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, a patentee's lack of knowledge of the need to pay the maintenance fee and the failure to receive the Maintenance Fee Reminder do not constitute unavoidable delay. *See Patent No. 4,409,763, supra; see also* "Final Rules for Patent Maintenance Fees" 49 Fed. Reg. 34716, 34722-34723 (August 31, 1984), *reprinted in* 1046 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 28, 34 (September 25, 1984). Under the statute and regulations, the Office has no duty to notify patentees of the requirement to pay maintenance fees or to notify patentees of the requirement to pay maintenance fees or to notify patentees when the maintenance fees are due. The Office's mailing of Maintenance Fee Reminders is carried out strictly as a courtesy. Accordingly, it is solely the responsibility of the patentee to assure that the maintenance fee is timely paid to prevent expiration of the patent. The lack of knowledge of the requirement to pay a maintenance fee and/or the failure to receive the Maintenance Fee Reminder will not shift the burden of monitoring the time for paying a maintenance fee from the patentee to the Office. *Rydeen v. Quigg*, 748 F. supp. at 900.

The record fails to show that petitioner took adequate steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. *In re Patent No. 4,461,759*, 16 USPQ2d 1883, 1884 (Comm'r Pat. 1990).

Petitioner must demonstrate, via a documented showing, that despite reasonable care by petitioner to implement reasonable steps to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fee, the maintenance fee was nevertheless, unavoidably not paid.

It is incumbent upon petitioner to demonstrate, via a documented showing, that this patent was docketed for the second maintenance fee payment in a reliable tracking system. The former counsel transferred control over this patent to petitioner prior to the due date for the maintenance fee. It appears that no one was monitoring the due date for the second maintenance fee payment.

Petitioner is advised that delay resulting from a failure in communication between a client and a registered practitioner is not unavoidable delay. *In Re Kim*, 12 U.S.P.Q.2d 1595 (Comm'r Pat. 1988). Delay resulting from a lack of proper communication between a patent holder and a registered representative as to who bore the responsibility for payment of a maintenance fee does not constitute unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 1.378(b). *See Ray*, at 610, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1789.

The record fails to disclose that petitioner took reasonable steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. The current record indicates that no steps were taken by petitioner to ensure timely payment of the 7 ½ year maintenance fee. It appears that petitioner's payment of the maintenance fee hinged on receiving an Office reminder.

In short, petitioner has not demonstrated, via a documented showing, that there was a reliable tracking system in place to monitor the due dates of maintenance fees and that a responsible party had docketed this patent in that system. Evidence should be submitted which demonstrates that despite reasonable care by petitioner to implement reasonable steps to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fees, the maintenance fee was nevertheless, unavoidably not paid.


The PATENT-POWER OF ATTORNEY OR REVOCATION OF POWER OF ATTORNEY WITH A NEW POWER OF ATTORNEY AND CHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS, filed February 10, 2012 has been entered and made of record. Please find enclosed a NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE OF POWER OF ATTORNEY.

Petitioner should also note that since the maintenance fee was proffered within 24 months of the date of expiration date of the patent, petitioner has an alternate remedy under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.378(c) which does not require a showing of the delay in timely paying the maintenance fee in order to reinstate the patent. The \$700 already submitted would be applied to the \$1,640 fee owed under 37 CFR 1.378(c), leaving a balance due of \$940.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

- By mail:** Mail Stop PETITION  
Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
- By hand:** U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petition  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- By FAX:** (571) 273-8300 - ATTN: Office of Petitions
- By internet:** EFS-Web  
[www.uspto.gov/ebs/efs\\_help.html](http://www.uspto.gov/ebs/efs_help.html)  
(for help using EFS-Web call the  
Patent Electronic Business Center  
at (866) 217-9197)

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3230

  
Shirene Willis Brantley  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions

Enclosure: NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE OF POWER OF ATTORNEY



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING OR 371(C) DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO./TITLE
10/092,018	03/06/2002	Zhe Huang	60988/P005US/10103489

11014

Corporate Patent Counsel  
nLight Photonics  
5408 NE 88th Street Building E  
Vancouver, WA 98665

**CONFIRMATION NO. 7604**  
**POA ACCEPTANCE LETTER**



Date Mailed: 03/27/2012

**NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE OF POWER OF ATTORNEY**

This is in response to the Power of Attorney filed 02/10/2012.

The Power of Attorney in this application is accepted. Correspondence in this application will be mailed to the above address as provided by 37 CFR 1.33.

/swbrantley/

Office of Data Management, Application Assistance Unit (571) 272-4000, or (571) 272-4200, or 1-888-786-0101